

SPEAKER NICHOL: The motion fails. We are back to the bill and we are to Senator Fenger. I raise the Call but would sure appreciate it if a few of you would stick around. Did you want to go back to the Governor's office? Senator Fenger.

SENATOR FENGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the Legislature, as the introducer of LR 50 and an opposer of LR 49, I had an opportunity to import some testifiers at the recent hearing. Among them were General George Keegan, Retired, who at the time was Director of Air Force Intelligence; also Dr. Igor Glagolev, who prior to his defection served with the Russians in negotiating the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty; also a gentleman by the name of Ray Caldwell who is the Director of Office of European Securities for our own State Department. After that public hearing, all three of these gentlemen emphasized to me their delight and, in fact, share surprise at the fair, impartial treatment given by the committee in the order of and the time allotted in the presentation of testimony. I think that speaks well for the process utilized by this Legislature, and for openers I would be remiss if I didn't pass this compliment on publicly to the committee and particularly to its chairman. Now that aside, let the record show that LR 49 and 50 was killed in that committee. Now because some of LR 49 and 50 is found in this new proposal, it is suggested that LR 57 is perhaps a merger. However, two offensive words that amount to national suicide are still found in LR 57. They are "immediate" and "freeze". Does anyone on this floor voting on this issue have any knowledge of the current status of military preparedness that would able you to decide whether or not an immediate freeze will in fact ease the dangers and the perils that, believe me, we all envision? You know, it is one thing for well intended people to congregate together and to voice their concerns about the dangers of the future, but asking this body to accept these words and to approve this concept without any of the input that we should have is unfair and also unrealistic. Now I have had the privilege of some declassified briefings and I know a couple of other senators on this floor have had the same opportunity, and anyone who believes that the term "immediate freeze" will ease world tensions is misinformed. In my view, it will, in fact, perpetuate the very real threat of Soviet domination. Before any immediate freeze can become an asset, people, we have some catching up to do. You know, our negotiating experience with the Soviets has not been successful in the past because either we have sent peace at any price advocates to the bargaining table or perhaps because honest, sincere people have had